REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action ("Action") dated April 3, 2008.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 17-25 are currently amended to improve form.

No new matter is added.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph. Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,103,653 to Iwatani (hereinafter "Iwatani") and U.S. Patent No. 5,940,819 to Beavin et al. (hereinafter "Beavin"). Claims 17-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Iwatani, Beavin, and U.S. Patent No. 5,825,772 to Dobbins et al. (hereinafter "Dobbins").

Amendments to claims 1 and 11 obviate the 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph Rejections

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to improve form. Specifically, language from the preamble of each claim has been copied into the body of each claim to more clearly recite the steps involved in the process.

In light of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph of amended claims 1 and 11.

The combination of Iwatani and Beavin fail to teach access path attributes as recited in Claims 1, 11, and 15

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration of the rejections in light of the comments below.

8

Applicants have reviewed Iwatani and Beavin carefully and how these publications were applied to the claimed subject matter and in particular reviewed the sections of these publications cited as support, when support citations were made.

All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). MPEP §2143.03.

The claimed subject matter recited in independent claims 1, 11, and 15, recite features absent from the teachings and disclosure of the combination of Iwatani and Beavin.

The Action states that Beavin bridges the gap between Iwatani and the claimed subject matter and teaches "having for the logical access paths an associated set of logical access path attributes consisting of at least one of a number of hops within a valid logical access path, a level of end-to-end redundancy for a valid logical access path, and a number of allocated ports for a valid logical access path" (see Action, Page 4).

Applicants have reviewed the Beavin patent and find no teaching of a logical access path or a logical access path having the attributes recited in claim 1, or even attributes that are similar.

Specifically, Beavin merely teaches query access paths in a relational database management system, as opposed to logical access paths, as recited in independent claim 1, that define "end-to-end access relationship between an application on a server and data LUNs stored on storage devices in a storage area network". The access paths of Beavin are query access paths that define the method used to access data specified in SQL commands. This method is shown in Figures 3 and 4 of Beavin. Beavin's access relationship is not an end-to-end access relationship between an application on a server and a data LUN as the access path of Beavin only prescribes a series of operations for having the user-specified query extract data from a data table. Thus, Beavin's access path is between a query and a data table, and is independent of the application that generates this query, whether a payroll program or other database access program. Thus, there is no end-to-end

9

access relationship between the application and the data. Yet claim 1 explicitly recites an access path defining an end-to-end access relationship between an application on a server and a data LUN.

Moreover, this is a distinction that matters as Beavin's query access paths cannot represent information flow capability between two physical devices on the query access paths because there are no such physical devices on Beavin's access paths. In this respect, Beavin's query access paths cannot be used to determine information flow capability because there is no physical communication link between two devices present on the access path. Yet this is the explicit subject matter recited in claims 17, 20, and 23.

Furthermore, the cited passages of Beavin (see Abstract, and Column 5, lines 6-8, Column 8, lines 44-52, Column 9, lines 31-41 in Beavin), and Beavin when read as a whole, do not teach access path attributes consisting of "at least one of a number of hops within a valid logical access path, a level of end-to-end redundancy for a valid logical access path, and a number of allocated ports for a valid logical access path", as recited in claim 1. Such access path attributes simply do not exist for the query access paths in Beavin's relational database management system because these attributes such as the "number of hops" or "a level of end-to-end redundancy" or the "number of allocated ports" for a valid logical access path, as recited in claim 1, do not make sense for Beavin's query access paths in a relational database management system, which is merely a series of operations for implementing a SQL command.

However, these access path attributes are specifically recited in independent claims 1, 11, and 15. It is also these access path attributes that allow for the validation of a state or a state change event of a storage area network, as recited in claims 1, 11, and 15. In particular, these independent claims recite systems and methods in which SAN logical access paths are identified and access path "attribute values are compared with the SAN access path policy to identify any logical path discrepancies or violations, thereby validating the state of the SAN".

Therefore, Beavin and Iwatani, taken alone or in combination, do not teach "having for the logical access paths an associated set of logical access path attributes consisting of at least one of a

10

number of hops within a valid logical access path, a level of end-to-end redundancy for a valid

logical access path, and a number of allocated ports for a valid logical access path" as recited in

claim 1. In addition, Beavin and Iwatani, taken alone or in combination, do not teach, describe, or

suggest a "SAN access path policy", as recited in claim 1. Thus, the combination of Beavin and

Iwatani does not teach how to compare computed access path attribute values "with a SAN access

path policy to identify any logical path discrepancies or violations, thereby validating the state of

the SAN", as recited in claim 1. It is clear that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to

apply the teachings of query access paths in Beavin to modify Iwatani to obtain the invention

recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Consequently, the combination of Iwatani and Beavin fails to disclose each and every

limitation of claim 1 as required by 35 U.S.C § 103(a), and a prima facie case of obviousness has

not been made. MPEP § 2143.03.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable. For at least the reasons given above, claims

11 and 15 are also allowable. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections of claims 1, 11, and 15

should be withdrawn.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), then any claim depending

therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). MPEP

§2143.03.

Claims 2-10, 12-14, and 16-25 variously depend from, and add limitations to, independent

claims 1 and 11. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections of these claims should be withdrawn

too.

Application No. 10/693,632   Docket No.: ONAR-P01-001
Amendment dated September 24, 2008
Reply to Office Action of April 3, 2008

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for immediate allowance.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response other than those indicated on the attached Transmittals. However, if additional fees are due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. ONAR-P01-001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 24, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

         Electronic signature: /Tushar Parlikar/
         Tushar Parlikar
           Registration No.: 61,715
         ROPES & GRAY LLP
         One International Place
         Boston, Massachusetts 02110
         (617) 951-7000
         (617) 951-7050 (Fax)
         Attorneys/Agents For Applicant